

Dear Chris,

I am the proud parent of a seven and one half year old daughter, who is diagnosed with high functioning autism (autism spectrum disorder) and ADHD combined subtype. I am writing you to protest SB 1105 because of the following:

1. The professionals identified in the language are not qualified to provide specific Applied Behavioral Analysis services;
2. There are already not enough SLP's, special education teachers and psychologists to meet CT's current educational needs so adding additional responsibilities to these professions will not meaningfully increase the number of providers for all children with IEPs (thus, a more global negative effect for the school, not just children with autism).
3. Without proper service delivery, students with autism not only will not learn but *can regress. This is very short sighted, considering the impact of the children affected, who do grow up.*
4. Supervision and direction by a designated administrator will add to the cost of providing services while decreasing the ability of qualified personnel to do their jobs.

Psychologists, speech therapists, and special education teachers are not usually trained to provide ABA services. *The phrase "Including but not limited to" in section 10-145b of the bill means that anyone with any type of credential may be designated to provide these service.* I object to this language specifically. Further, the design and implementation of a plan with Applied Behavior Analysis should not be done by an administrator who is not certified in ABA itself.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. I appreciate your taking the time to understand what this proposed legislation would do to everyone's children, and I hope that there is careful deliberation on re-crafting this bill with specific, relevant and correct language that will address my concerns.

Sincerely,
Laurie A. Vaillancourt-Pugsley